

## **REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed April 19, 2005. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are pending in the application with Claims 2 and 7 being in independent form.

### **I. Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 7-10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application No. 08-314389 issued to Sugimura et al. (hereinafter, "Sugimura et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,582 issued to Yeager et al. (hereinafter, "Yeager et al."). The rejection, with regards to Claims 2 and 7, is respectfully traversed.

Sugimura et al. teaches an information equipment on which various LCD display units can be interchangeably mounted. However, Sugimura et al. fails to disclose or suggest having at least one first spacer inserted between a back face of the display panel and an inner main-face of the panel-mounting case, such that the display panel is placed in the predetermined panel-mounting case through at least one first spacer; and at least one second spacer for positioning and fixing the display panel along its up-and-down direction panel, wherefore the at least one second spacer is provided between a lower inner side face of the panel-mounting case and a lower outer side face of the display panel, as recited in Claim 7 and similarly recited in Claim 2.

Yeager et al. teaches an LCD adapter mounting for a computer cover. The Examiner asserts that the spring fingers 60 taught in Yeager et al. serve an equivalent function as Applicant's first and second spacers. However, according to Yeager et al. the spring fingers 60 are employed not for any structural support but rather as grounding contacts for EMI shielding

(see col. 2, lines 55-58 and col. 3, lines 1-3). Yeager et al. does not disclose the spring fingers performing any fixative function. In fact, spring fingers for making contact in ‘the known manner’ as disclosed in Yeager et al. are designed to mold themselves to the LCD panel without exerting undo pressure by compressing under the force exerted by the mounted LCD panel, thus they would not have the structural rigidity to hold the LCD panel in a fixed position, especially when the panel is actively opened and closed, or jostled.

Therefore, Sugimura et al. and Yeager et al. taken alone or in any proper combination does not anticipate Applicant’s Claim 2. Independent Claim 7 recites similar language to Claim 2. Accordingly, for at least the reasons presented above, Claims 2 and 7 are believed patentably distinct over the cited prior art references.

With regards to Claims 3-5 and 8-10, these claims are dependent from Independent Claims 2 and 7 and therefore are limited by the language recited by those independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to Claims 2-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sugimura et al. in view of Yeager et al. and allowance thereof.

## CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 2-5, 7-10 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Paul J. Esatto, Jr.  
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam